

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
WESTERN DIVISION

No. 5:06-CT-3118-D

DANIEL LEE BROWN,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
SERGEANT DUDA, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

No. 5:06-CT-3134-D


CORNELIUS TUCKER, JR. and)	
DANIEL LEE BROWN,)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
)	ORDER
v.)	
)	
ELISHA WHIPKEY, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

On March 28, 2007, an order was entered by the court to inform Daniel Lee Brown of his rights as a plaintiff in the above-captioned actions. Brown was directed to notify the court of his intent to file and pursue these actions. He was given until April 6, 2007, to respond to the court's order. No response has been filed by Daniel Lee Brown in either matter. Due to his failure to comply with the court order, both cases are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.¹ Accordingly, the

¹ The court notes that while a filing has been made in Tucker and Brown v. Whipkey, No. 5:06-CT-3134-D, dated April 3, 2007, it does not respond to the court order or address the intent of Daniel Lee Brown. The filing simply attacks the integrity of several of the federal district judges

Clerk is DIRECTED to CLOSE both of the cases.

SO ORDERED. This the 2 day of May 2007.



JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge

within this district, details, in a rambling nonsensical way, the alleged systemic harassment of Cornelius Tucker, and seeks to include Trevon Steele as a plaintiff. In the caption, the motion also seeks recusal of the undersigned, reconsideration of the March 28, 2007, order, and inclusion of the undersigned as a named defendant. Daniel Lee Brown does not sign the filing, nor is he mentioned. The filing was mailed in an envelope with a return address labeled Trevon Steele and both Trevon Steele and Cornelius Tucker have signed the filing. The “motion” does not constitute a proper response to the March 28, 2007, order.